[Sri P. K. Krishnankutty Menon]

ടിയെ വാങ്ങിക്കുന്ന എന്നുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടുമാത്രം നിയമസഭയിലെ ഒരു അംഗമായിരിക്കുന്നതിനു് അയാൾക്കു് അയോഗ്യതയുണ്ടായിരിക്കുകയില്ല. നിയമസഭയിൽനിന്നും രൂപീകരിക്കുന്ന കമ്മറ്റി അംഗങ്ങൾക്കും അയോഗ്യത ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കയില്ല.

മൂന്നാമത്തെ സബ്ക്ലാസ് ചേർത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു് ഒരു പ്രത്യേക കാരണംകൊണ്ടാണു്. ഇന്ത്യൻ ഭരണഘടന മലയാളത്തിൽ തർജ്ജിമ ചെയ്യാൻ ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റിയെ നിയമിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ആ കമ്മിറ്റിയിലെ അംഗങ്ങൾ അതു് തർജ്ജിമചെയ്തു പരിശോധിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയാണു്. മുഴുവൻ പരിശോധിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. അവർക്കും office of profit എന്ന നിലയ്ക്കു് ഡിസ്ക്വാളിഫിക്കേഷൻ വരുമെന്നുള്ള വിചാരംകൊണ്ടാണു് ഈ മൂന്നാമത്തെ സബ്ക്ലാസ് ചേർത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്.

ഇവയല്ലാതെ യാതൊരു വ്യത്യാസവും, സെലക്ട്കമ്മിറ്റി ഈ ബില്ലിൽ വരുത്തിയിട്ടില്ല.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: Sir, I move as an amendment that it may be recommitted to another Select Committee with reference to the particular changes that are made by the Select Committee. The rule relating to the amendment is Standing Order 39. There it is stated that there should be two clear days for notice an amendment. The Select Committee report was published on 25th and programmed for presentation on the 27th. It is defined in the rule that there should be two clear days notice for the amendment before the day on which the Bill is to be considered.

Mr. Speaker: With regard to the point raised by Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai as the hon. Member wishes to move amendments, the Bill may be considered tomorrow. Hon. Members who want to move amendments may give notice today itself.

The hon. Minister for Education may now move for the third reading of the Co-operative Societies Bill the next item.

The Travancore-Cochin Co-operative Societies Bill

Minister for Education and Revenue **(Sri. L. M. Pylee):** Sir, before moving the Co-operative Societies Bill for the third reading, I have to refer to a suggestion put forward yesterday in the course of discussions on certain amendments by Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai. He suggested that Government may consider the feasibility of introducing an amendment to sub-clause 3 of clause 31. In this connection, I may mention that Government could bring an amendment at the final stage only in the form of a formal amendment or it must be consequential upon some amendment made after the Bill was taken into consideration. In the opinion of Government this provision is absolutely unnecessary. If the Member still thinks it is desirable to have such a clarification I may just move an amendment. If the House is unanimously of the opinion that it may be accepted, Government have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 42 applies to this question. "No amendment may be moved which is not either formal or consequential upon an amendment made after the Bill was taken into consideration." Therefore, if the House is unanimous that the amendment be moved the hon. Minister may move the amendment. The Chair has no objection.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: I oppose this amendment. This is a complicated question of law and ought not to be dealt with so lightly.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sri. L. M. Pylee: That has no bearing upon the present amendment.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: The question of heirship and other allied questions often turn out to be complicated questions of law. The Registrar has neither the training nor the time at his disposal for a proper consideration of this question. These are matters which could be properly dealt with only by a Civil Court. The finding out of the legal representatives by the Registrar may not be so easy. That is why such questions are often left to the Civil Court. For example, even in the Forest Act when a Kudivila case is a complicated one, the Forest Officer is invested with the power of referring it to the District Court without deciding it himself. It is better to leave the matter as it is without complicating it further.

Sri. L. M. Pylee: My suggestion is that if the House is unanimous it may be moved. Government are not very particular that the amendment should be moved. In view of the objection, I don't move it, Sir. I move that the Travancore-Cochin Co-operative Societies Bill, as amended at the second reading, be passed.

Sri. K. M. Korah: I second the motion.

The question that the Co-operative Societies Bill be passed was put and carried.

The Bill was passed.

The Travancore-Cochin Sale of Khaddar Bill

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the Travancore-Cochin Sale of Khadar Bill clause by clause.

Clauses 2 to 4

The question that clauses 2 to 4 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

The clauses were added to the Bill.

Sri. P. Nanoo: I want to bring to the notice of the Minister one thing. In clause 2 (a), it is given that 'a dealer means a person carrying on the business of selling Khaddar or Khadi and clause 5 says that a licensing authority may grant a licence on the application of a 'dealer'. I want to know whether it is the object of the mover of this Bill that licences for the sale of Khadi would be given only to persons who are already dealers in Khadi.

Sri. K. M. Korah: No, it is not the intention. All that is meant by this clause is that a dealer who carries on business can be granted a licence.

Sri. P. Nanoo: Suppose a person who is not a dealer in Khadi applies for licence? Should he not be given licence?

Sri. K. M. Korah: I submit that the interpretation given by the hon. Member is not correct.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: Some difficulty has arisen in Mr. Nanoo's interpretation. If we read clause 5, we will find that a person who wants to apply must be a dealer. It is not any person who can apply for licence. That is the wording in clause 5.

Sri. K. M. Korah: Will not the difficulty be over if instead of the word 'dealer', the word 'person' is substituted? I shall move an amendment when clause 5 is taken up.

The House rose for lunch at 12-40 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-0 p.m. with Mr. Speaker in the Chair

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly